



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CARRIERS — TICKETS — INJUNCTION AGAINST TICKET-BROKERS. — The defendant ticket-brokers intended to buy and sell special reduced rate non-transferable tickets about to be issued by the plaintiff. *Held*, that the threatened sale of such tickets may be enjoined. *Bitterman v. Louisville & Nashville R. Co.*, 207 U. S. 205.

The precise legal nature of railroad tickets is by no means settled. Some authorities regard them as contracts, some as the evidence of contracts, some as mere vouchers. But, under any view, the ticket is a means adopted by the carrier and passenger to aid in the execution of their contract; and in every case where the right to be carried is non-transferable, the passenger either expressly or impliedly contracts not to transfer the ticket. *See D. L. & W. R. R. Co. v. Frank*, 110 Fed. 689, 692. Accordingly the court rests its decision upon the familiar principle that any third person inducing a breach of contract by a promisor is liable in tort to the promisee. In the present case an injunction is the only adequate remedy because of the multiplicity of suits necessary to recover damages and the practical impossibility of detecting the great majority of the illegal transactions. Consequently, since the legal remedy is inadequate, equity will give relief. Although a new application of an established doctrine, the reasoning of the court seems irrefutable and the same result has frequently been reached upon different grounds. *See Nashville, etc., Ry. v. McConnell*, 82 Fed. 65.

CONFLICT OF LAWS — MAKING AND VALIDITY OF CONTRACTS — CONTRACTS CONCERNING LAND. — The defendant contracted in Minnesota to sell land in Colorado to the plaintiff. The contract contained a clause that if the plaintiff should fail to pay at a specified time the contract should be voidable at the defendant's option. This clause was valid according to Colorado law but invalid according to Minnesota law. On the plaintiff's failure to pay as required, the defendant notified him of his repudiation of the contract. *Held*, that the plaintiff may recover damages for failure to convey. *Finnes v. Selover, etc., Co.*, 113 N. W. 883 (Minn.).

It is undoubted law that interests in real estate can be acquired or lost only in accordance with the *lex loci rei sitæ*. *Roberston v. Pickrell*, 109 U. S. 608. But contracts to convey land are not necessarily governed by the same law. Thus a contract to convey, valid at the place where made, will be enforced at the place where the land is situated, although such contract would have been void if made in the latter state. *Polson v. Stewart*, 167 Mass. 211; see 10 HARV. L. REV. 523. And in general where the defendant has put himself under obligations with regard to land, either *ex contractu* or *ex delicto*, relief will be granted where such obligation arose, regardless of the law of the situs. *Ex parte Pollard*, Mont. & C. 239; see 20 HARV. L. REV. 382. It follows from these cases that the validity of the contract depends upon the *lex loci contractus*, and that relief will be granted in such state in spite of the law of the situs. To be sure, if the latter refuses to recognize an interest as being created in the *res*, relief *in rem* is impossible, but relief *in personam*, as in the present case, should be granted.

CONFLICT OF LAWS — MARRIAGE — JURISDICTION FOR NULLIFICATION. — A, an Englishwoman, was married in England to B, a Frenchman. This marriage was declared void by the French court because B, who was not of full age by French law, had not obtained the parental consent. A then married C in England. C sought a decree of nullity on the ground that the first marriage was valid by the English law, and in spite of the French decree. *Held*, that he is entitled to the decree. *Ogden v. Ogden*, [1908] P. 46.

For a discussion of this case in a lower court, see 20 HARV. L. REV. 412.

CONFLICT OF LAWS — PERSONAL JURISDICTION — NOTICE TO PRODUCE CORPORATION BOOKS FROM A FOREIGN JURISDICTION. — Pursuant to a statute, a foreign corporation doing business in Vermont was served in the state with a notice to produce before a local grand jury certain corporation